



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

| P.O. Box 1450 | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 | |
| MANAY HERIO GOV | |

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING D | ATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 09/388,351 | 09/01/1999 | | ERIK J. SNAPPER | 03797.77746 | 3809 |
| 28319 | 7590 0 | 02/10/2004 | | EXAM | NER |
| BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., | | | BASHORE, WILLIAM L | | |
| ATTORNEYS | FOR MICRO | SOFT | • | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| ELEVENTH S | STREET | • | | 2176 | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597 | | | | DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004 | , 17 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/388,351 | SNAPPER ET AL. | | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | William L. Bashore | 2176 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 28 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverset, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or | f the final rejection. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moteraned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mat | erially reducing or simplifying the | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel | ing a corresponding number of | finally rejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | |
| $3.\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | tion(s): | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a s | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See | r reconsideration has been cons e Continuation Sheet. | sidered but does NOT place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | (s) a)□ will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided bek |)□ will be entered and an ow or appended. | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | • | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | roved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | | | | | | |
| I0. ☐ Other: | , » <u>F</u> = · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 1 2/1 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | / 55 | SEPH FEILD TY PATENT EXAMINER | | | | |



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Kikinis teaches selection of a name tag, which a least is indicative of (and/or suggestive of) a value (especially at code level). Kikinis inherently discloses detecting a user-initiated action and inhibiting copying of the suggested data value into the data entry region until after receipt of the user-initiated action inasmuch as Kikinis teaches copying the suggested data value into the data entry region upon detecting a user-initiated action. Such copying would not have taken place (i.e., would have been inhibited) until after receipt of the user-initiated action. See also Final office action.